

REMARKS

A petition and fee for a one-month extension to reply to the Office Action is being submitted concurrently herewith.

Claims 1 and 8-12 have been amended. Claims 2 and 5-7 have been canceled. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendment can be found in the Specification and the claims as originally filed, in particular, paragraph 7 and claim 2.

The Applicant affirms the election to prosecute the claims of Group I as defined by the Examiner's restriction requirement.

Claims 9-12 have been amended to delete the term "about." Claims 1, 8 and 12 and the Specification have been amended to correct typographical errors. The range of the y color coordinate in claims 1 and 8 has been amended to recite a maximum value of 0.440.

The rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee is respectfully traversed. Contrary to the Examiner's contention, the Applicant respectfully asserts that the lowest y color coordinate in the region specified by Lee is 0.450. (Paragraphs 11 and 22). The amended claims recite a y color coordinate of 0.420 to 0.440 which is below the lowest value in the region described by Lee. The Applicant respectfully asserts that the Examiner's contention that Lee discloses a y color coordinate of 0.420 to 0.460 is incorrect. Lee does disclose a conventional phosphor having an (x,y) color coordinate of (0.55, 0.43). (Paragraphs 8, 21 and 33) However, the x value of this material, 0.55, is outside of the Applicant's claimed range for the x color coordinate (0.420 to 0.500). Thus, the Applicant respectfully asserts that the claimed invention is not anticipated by Lee.

The rejection of claims 3 and 4 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Hampden-Smith is respectfully traversed. The Applicant reasserts the above arguments with respect to Lee. In addition, the Applicant would like to point out that there is no motivation in Lee or Hampden-Smith to produce an electroluminescent phosphor having a lower y value. In particular, Lee indicates that higher y values are desired as compared to the conventional phosphor. (Paragraphs 8 and 37) Consequently, one skilled in the art would not be motivated to make a phosphor having an (x,y) value within the same range of (x,y) values claimed by the Applicant. Moreover, there is nothing in Lee which indicates that the phosphors described

therein are electroluminescent (excitation by electric field). Lee describes only cathodoluminescence (excitation by electron bombardment, Paragraphs 7 and 34) and photoluminescence (excitation by light, Table 1). (See also, Hampden-Smith at col. 35, lines 18-33.) Thus, the Applicant respectfully asserts that the claimed invention is not obvious in view of Lee and Hampden-Smith.


The rejection of claims 8-12 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Huber et al. is respectfully traversed. The Applicant reasserts the above arguments with respect to Lee. In addition, the Applicant strongly disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of the lamp described in Huber et al. This is clearly not an electroluminescent lamp.

Electroluminescent lamps are of the type described in the Applicant's Specification at Paragraphs 2-5. The lamp described in Huber et al. is a gas discharge lamp that emits radiation in the vacuum ultraviolet (VUV) region of the electromagnetic spectrum (See, Abstract). The phosphors described therein are photoluminescent, excitable by the ultraviolet radiation. (e.g., Paragraphs 3, 6, and 11). There is absolutely no motivation to combine the discharge lamp of Huber et al. with the phosphor of Lee to make the Applicant's claimed electroluminescent lamp. Thus, the Applicant respectfully asserts that the claimed invention is not obvious in view of Lee and Huber et al.

With respect to claims 9-12, the Examiner does not appear to have given any patentable weight to the brightness and half-life limitations. However, the Applicant respectfully asserts that these are properties of the lamp when the lamp is operated at the specific conditions. The lamp properties are therefore entitled to patentable weight.

In view of the foregoing amendment, it is believed that the Examiner's rejections have been overcome and that the application is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert F. Clark
Reg. No. 33,853

OSRAM SYLVANIA Inc.
100 Endicott St.
Danvers, MA 01923